

THE GAZETTE.

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 22.

THE TAX OUGHT TO BE RETURNED.

Gov. J. M. Rusk, who was in Milwaukee Saturday, was asked concerning the statement made by Henry Smith that the state had an agent at Washington who would have furnished him with the sum of \$20,000 if the direct tax law contributed by Wisconsin had been returned. Henry Smith has made this statement in all his speeches to excite his position in the state with the return of this money. He claimed the other night, in his speech at the Standard theatre, that Wisconsin had an agent in Washington to whom the state had agreed to pay 20 per cent. of \$100,000 due to the state.

"There is no truth whatever in that statement," said the governor. "The bill allowed the state of Wisconsin the amount it paid over, which is about \$240,000. The state has no agent whatever looking after this claim; it was left entirely in the hands of our representatives in congress. And if the bill had passed congress, every cent that was appropriated by it would go into the treasury of the state of Wisconsin, and not one dollar to any broker or agent. The statement made by Mr. Smith is a falsehood out of whole cloth."

"You think, of course, that this money ought to be returned to the state?"

"I do not see how any congressman in this state could vote against the claim. This amount was advanced to the government twenty years ago, and it is an outlay upon the state that is not interested. It ought to be refunded with interest."

THE COBDEN CLUB'S SPHERE.

Here is what a committee of the Cobden Club reported to the club after looking over the field in 1898:

"Your committee continues to afford all the assistance in their power to those who are laboring in the free trade cause in foreign countries. In America in the course of political events there is great promise. The result of the turn of public attention in this direction is seen in the fact that reform is becoming a leading question in the presidential contest, and is on the winning side."

Years before the London Times, of July 12, 1890, had declared:

"How free trade will come some day to the United States must be left to the Cobden club and to its twelve cabinet members in their unofficial capacity to decide. It is the New World that the club is chiefly looking as the most likely sphere for its vigorous foreign policy. It has done what it can for Europe and is now turning its eyes westward and bracing itself for the struggle which is to come. So it will go on until reform is achieved, and then it will be a great triumph. It is the Cobden club which has held United States in which it has introduced itself. We intend to break down the protective system in the United States and to substitute the British system. That done, our victory is complete and final."

America's workmen, do you want to see the triumph of the British free trade club?

Executive session of democratic national campaign committee—Bris, has the Chairman Times called in its northwestern rover yet?"

"No."

"What state is he carrying to-day?"

"Iowa. He carried Minnesota yesterday; made Wisconsin uncertain before yesterday; will turn over Michigan to-day after to-morrow, and between time will elect Palmer in Illinois."

"Well, Bill."

"Bris, I'm an old hand and I never yet that a dear with a B-Ht corner nor saw a republican plurality reduced in a republican state by a meiotic trip through its boundaries in a parlor car. Bring, you might as well expect that blooming party of cats in Mississippi to allow a party to enter a republican ballot as to expect Cleveland and his d-d free trade to carry one extra vote out of that great northwest. Bris, Indiana is doubtful and New York is worse. It's the dollar-a-vote gang of this same blessed old that's going to elect Cleveland, if anything can. Look to it, Bris; look to it. Hark the farmers. You can't reason with 'em. What we want is a B-Ht, mates."

(Meeting adj. until 9:15.)

Albany Journal: The three greatest achievements for the welfare of this nation since it was formed were the work of the northern states.

The north destroyed slavery!

The north preserved the union!

The north supported and maintained the policy of protection!

The three greatest wrongs against the nation ever committed in this land (since the close of the revolutionary war) were committed and sustained by the south. Nullification, for which the south was ready to fight.

Slavery, for which it fought.

Secession, which cost it the slaves.

In the constitution of the confederate states was the first assault upon protection: "No shall any duties or taxes on importation from foreign nations be laid to promote or foster any branch of industry."

The question in this campaign now is whether the policy of the north, which has done so much for the life, the prosperity, and the welfare of this nation, shall prevail, or whether the south, which has been defeated, and justly defeated, in every great issue it has made, shall dictate what the country's policy shall be.

A somewhat remarkable thing took place in the river just below Evansville, Indiana, on the morning of October 20th. A few days since the steamer Robert B. Carson sunk in forty feet of water, together with thirty head of cattle confined on the lower deck. For two or three days a number of heads did all in their power to raise the sunken boat, but with

AT GROVER'S HOME.

Mr. Blaine Addresses the Republican Members at Buffalo.

HIS CRITICISM OF THE MILLS BILL.

His Remarks Charged with Having Made Important Changes in the Free List Solely Through Partisan Motives.

Buffalo, N. Y., Oct. 22.—Mr. Blaine arrived here from the West Monday evening. There was no demonstration at the depot, the party consisting of the governor, the mayor, and the city fathers, and being driven to the Hotel House. Later Mr. Blaine addressed an audience of 5,000 persons at the Main Street Rink. He was accorded an enthusiastic welcome, the cheering continuing for several minutes, and his remarks in criticism of the Mills bill being interspersed by many manifestations of approval. He said:

"One of the most frequently repeated arguments of the Democrats in favor of what they call 'tariff reform' is the necessity for the admission of all raw materials free of duty. They have it in their minds to exploit the provisions of that bill to the detriment of the protection of the tariff. It is a suppression of the truth. If I am not mistaken, the Mills bill contains the most desirable features of legislation ever introduced in a tariff measure, and it is a measure of compromise and not of concession."

Mr. Blaine then declared that the original design of the framers of the bill was to add a duty of 10 per cent. to the tariff, but that the Democratic Party had changed it to 15 per cent. and that the Republican Party had changed it to 20 per cent. He then declared that the bill was a measure of compromise and not of concession, and that it was a measure of compromise and not of concession.

When President Cleveland looked upon him sitting among the platform, of the most important thing in a tariff was that he should be a good statesman, that he should be a good statesman, that he should be a good statesman.

These lines are from Colonel Thomas W. Higginson's Cambridge speech. Very truly reach the lowest of man's wretchedness. It would seem that Colonel Higginson admires Cleveland for the great place he covers when he is in down, and by that capacity measures his greatness. Well, the republicans give in. If a man's greatness must be judged by the size of his seat, then Mr. Cleveland is the greatest man. But however the republican candidate carries his greatness in another part of his body, Harrison has heart, conscience and brains.

"Tell the truth" seems to be a coming back to the fact of free trade, it seems to be undeniable that this is the ally of policy of the democratic party, and the Mills bill is only a step toward its consummation. And for that day we pray "God send it soon."

Two weeks from to-day and then—Hurray for victory.

PROHIBITION WINS.

The Iowa State Law Upheld by the United States Supreme Court in the Celebrated Kidd Case.

Washington, Oct. 23.—The Supreme Court today rendered its decision in the celebrated case of John S. Kidd, plaintiff in error, vs. I. Pearson and S. J. Loughran. Kidd was an Iowa distiller who claimed that under the State Prohibition law, State officers could not prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State. He sought to restrain the State officers from closing up his distillery. He claimed that he was licensed by the board of supervisors of Polk County to sell liquor for medicinal purposes during the period of the alleged violations of the law. His business in the sale of liquor for medicinal purposes was not a part of the State's business, and he claimed that the State had no right to interfere with it. The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

The court, however, held that the State had the right to regulate the manufacture of liquor within the State, and that the State officers could prevent the manufacture of liquor within the State for export to another State.

WANTS CLEVELAND TO WIN.

Governor Hill Prefers Defeat with the President to Re-Election Without Him.

New York, Oct. 22.—Chairman Bruce of the Democratic National Committee, in the course of some remarks to the business men's Cleveland and Thurman club yesterday, said that in his interview Sunday with Governor Hill the Governor assured him that he was a firm friend of the administration; that if President Cleveland could not be re-elected the Governor would rather be defeated than to be elected and have President Cleveland defeated. If a Democratic Governor was elected without a Democratic President, said Governor Hill, it would be a death blow to his (Governor Hill's) political ambitions.

Consented for the New York Democrat.

Mayor Croker, Oct. 22.—The city's jury investigating the wreck which occurred on the Tenth Avenue road at Tammen and which resulted in the loss of ten lives, and the injury to twice as many, agreed on the following verdict:

"The engineer of the Pennsylvania freight train is charged with running at a high rate of speed, and with neglecting to sound the whistle for crossing orders, and the flagman is charged with negligence for not signaling the approaching train sooner."

Small Favors Will Be Thankfully Received.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

Wanted for the New York Democrat.

FULL WEIGHT PURE.

DR. PRICE'S CREAM BAKING POWDER.

MOST PERFECT MADE.

DR. PRICE'S CREAM BAKING POWDER.

DR. PRICE'S CREAM BAKING POWDER.

DR. PRICE'S CREAM BAKING POWDER.

DR. PRICE'S CREAM BAKING POWDER.

DR. PRICE'S CREAM BAKING POWDER.

DR. PRICE'S CREAM BAKING POWDER.

DR. PRICE



\$1,000

That we have the finest line of
Cooking Stoves!
Heating Stoves
And Ranges.

We Can Save You Money
 And give you good orders. Our stock
 Builders Hardware, Cutlery and
TINWARE
 is well stocked and guaranteed right.



TIN SHOP in Connection with Store.

All kinds of Tin and Sheet Iron Work
Setting-up Stoves, etc. done by first-class Workmen. Don't forget

LOWELL'S !

Cash Hardware Store, 11 River St.

Dr. C. L. Martin wishes to announce to the people of Janesville and Rock county that after a confidential period of thirty years, he has entered into partnership with him Dr. G. Bed-
ford, member of the Medical Terminals College, London, and trusts that strict attention to busi-
ness can be combined with

Reasonable Charges
To enjoy a liberal patronage hitherto bestowed to him.
Operations Carefully Performed
In both city and country. Horse and Cattle
medicines of the best quality.

MARTIN & BEDFORD.
Veterinary Surgeons, Janesville, Wis.
OFFICE: B'n'd St. Citydawn

SEPTEMBER 1ST

We Will

Be in position to show the
cleanest, new (all new)
stock of

WOOLENS

in Rock Co. for this Fall
and Winter.

*We sold out Spring all our
Heavy weights.
Can show you no old fash-
ions now.
A change complete in all the
style.
Try us this time and be
convinced.*

HATS

By particular attention in
this department, we will
show the "proper mode"

in Stiffs and Sorts.

KNEFF & ALLEN,

Milwaukee St., East End of Bridge.

COFFEES

A Specialty.

We roast our Coffee and claim them to be better and cheaper than any "4 pounds for a dollar Coffee". We sell 5 pounds for a dollar and it IS WORTH THE MONEY.

DENNISTON.

The finest Orleans, Farmhouse Black Tea in the market.
DENNISTON

Something new—Palvanized Buck Candy.
DENNISTON.

Our New Canned Goods are coming in—low prices.
DENNISTON.

Fancy Wax Candles—one to the pound to 38
 DENNISTON.
 Baked White Fish and Sugar Cured meats. DENNISTON
 California-Fruits, Grapes, Plums, Peas
 Quinces, etc., etc. DENNISTON.
 New Honey, Jellies, Preserves and Rice
 meal. DENNISTON.
 Fancy Fresh Canned Fruits. DENNISTON.
 The Choice at Confectionery. DENNISTON.
 You can always find the best assorted stock
 of goods to select from at DENNISTON'S

Janesville City Hospital.

A private institution in which excellent accommodations, board, attendance and medical service can be obtained at reasonable price. Reason to all the physicians in the city. For information address S. B. Smith, President, or K. B. Heinsteat, Secretary, Jameville, Wis.


BEST STOCK !
of Goods
Ever



W. PAKER & CO., Dorchester, M




Brought
to
This
Market
in
the
Line
of
Crockery



GLASS, SILVER, BRASS GOODS,
As can be seen at
WHEELOCK'S

Crockery and House-Furnishing Store
 Splendid assortment of Lamps—the \$1.00
 Lamps are excellent.
 New styles of painted Chamber Pots, \$2.25, up.
 Many of the latest novelties on \$c, 10c and 25c
 counters. Pearl Top Chimneys.



10 CORN EXCHANGE

MEN ONLY LOTS OF WASHINGTON, BATHING, AND
 25¢ Family Vapor, Corals, Neck
 Ties, etc. 100% FINE. Etc. See C. Phillips.

been so wise,
and they not sought
for knowledge,
And used their ears
and eyes
In getting infor-
mation
every sort and kind,
and of going through
world
both deaf and blind.
as they,
ay

LAUS—
 ur work
 u care to undertake.
 AUS SOAP.
 CO., CHICAGO.
 CATE LANDS.
 F WISCONSIN.
 of the Public Lands
 is, Sept. 1st, 1888.
 cultural College, Forfeited Mor
 been forfeited by reason of th
 sale at public auction, at th
 some better redeemed accord
 continue from day to day until al
 at.
 istry, which will be offered at th
 ution due state," which I clud
 here to January 1st, 1889, an
 which have been returned again
 all unpaid taxes assessed again
 by the Commissioners at the sal
 M. K. Secretary of State.
 M. K. Attorney General.

[illegible][illegible][illegible]

WAK, NERVOUS PEOPLE
And others suffering from
headaches, dizziness, nervousness,
and exhausting
debility, are
of young or old are
of the
ELECTRO-MAGNETIC
CURE
In every State in the Union
and especially in the West.
Persons who can wear the
instruments, KLAUTCHKE'S POLAR
instruments, for
OWNER, INVENTOR, 911 WABASH ST.,
CHICAGO, ILL.

CAMPAIGN GOOD
Our new CAMPAIGN BOOK OF
THE POLYGRAPH, with con-
tact tables and full informa-
tion for
organizing and getting March
ILLUSTRATED CATALOGUE F.
A. G. SPALDING & BROS.
108 Madison St., 241 Broadway,
CHICAGO, ILL.

